

ANNEX A



WAVERLEY PARKING REVIEW 2015 CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS

11 DECEMBER 2015

Page 113

SUMMARY

In accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, The Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 this report has been produced as a summary of objections to the 2015 Parking review proposals.

The officer recommendation is marked in bold after the response to the last objection for each location. It is necessary to refer to the map-based plans in Annex B used in the consultation.

Locations relating to the changing of the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) only - with no required amendments on the ground - are listed "TRO only".

The number of objections is in bold.

ITEM 11

Waverley Parking Review 2015 - Consideration of objections – 11 DECEMBER 2015			
Plan No.	Road/Location	Number of objections	Status
FARNHAM NORTH			
24004	126 – 136 Farnborough Road	1	Proceed as advertised
24008	Alma Lane j/w Heath Lane	4 1 Support	Proceed as advertised
24127	Spring Lane (TRO only)	None	Proceed as advertised
FARNHAM CENTRAL			
24017	Castle Street (TRO only)	None	Proceed as advertised
24015	East Street (TRO only)	None	Proceed as advertised
24023	The Hart (TRO only)	None	Proceed as advertised
24024	Abbey Street (TRO only)	None	Proceed as advertised
24028	Firgrove Hill j/w Approach Road (TRO only)	None	Proceed as advertised
24030	Menin Way (TRO only)	None	Proceed as advertised
24028	Trafalgar Court (TRO only)	None	Proceed as advertised
24121	Lancaster Avenue (TRO only)	None	Proceed as advertised
24023	West Street	None	Proceed as advertised
24018	Lower South View	4	Proceed as advertised
24029	Alfred Road	1	Proceed as advertised
24030	Menin Way	3	Proceed as advertised
24023	College Gardens	4 1 Comment (13 Signature Petition)	Proceed with amendments
24031	The Chantrys j/w West Street	2 3 Support	Proceed as advertised
24024	Long Bridge	None	Proceed as advertised
24015 24016	Guildford Road and Forge Close	8 2 Support 3 Comment	Proceed as advertised

FARNHAM SOUTH			
24037	Greenfield Road	2 1 Comment	Proceed as advertised
24130	Stream Farm Close j/w Frensham Road	21 Support	Proceed as advertised
HASLEMERE			
24051	Wey Hill (TRO only)	None	Proceed as advertised
24047	Lower Road	None	Proceed as advertised
24117	Courts Hill Road	1	Proceed as advertised
24117	Hill Road	1 Comment	Proceed as advertised
24059	Old Haslemere Road j/w Hill Road	None	Proceed as advertised
24054	Popes Mead	1	Proceed as advertised
CRANLEIGH			
24102	High Street	None	Proceed as advertised
24104			
24104	Ewhurst Road	None	Proceed as advertised
WAVERLEY EASTERN VILLAGES			
24097	High Street, Bramley (TRO only)	None	Proceed as advertised
24096	Station Road, Bramley	None	Proceed as advertised
WAVERLEY WESTERN VILLAGES			
24045	Portsmouth Road, Hindhead (TRO only)	None	Proceed as advertised
GODALMING NORTH			
24090	Station Road (TRO only)	None	Proceed as advertised
24093			
24090	Farncombe Street (TRO only)	None	Proceed as advertised
24079	Woolsack Way j/w Woolsack Way (TRO only)	None	Proceed as advertised
24077	Lower South Street (TRO only)	None	Proceed as advertised

24092	9 George Road	None	Proceed as advertised
24091	Owen Road	None	Proceed as advertised
24091	St John's Street	None	Proceed as advertised
24088	Fern Road	None	Proceed as advertised
24088	Wey Court	None	Proceed as advertised
24087	Charterhouse Road	None	Proceed as advertised
24079	Scizdons Climb	1 4 Support	Proceed as advertised
24077	Mint Street (Southern Section)	None	Proceed as advertised
24080	Bridge Road	None	Proceed as advertised
24079	Langham Close j/w Catteshall Lane	1 1 Support	Proceed as advertised
24083	Peperharow Road	1 Comment	Proceed as advertised
No Dwg.	The Mint and Cow Lane	1 Support 2 Comment	Proceed as advertised
GODALMING SOUTH, MILFORD AND WITLEY			
24070	The Paddock j/w The Drive, Godalming	3 Support 2 Comment	Proceed as advertised
24072	Brighton Road, Godalming	11 3 Support 5 Comment	Proceed as advertised
24072	Underhill Close, Godalming	1 Support	Proceed as advertised
24135	Brook Road, Wormley	4 Support	Proceed as advertised
BOROUGH WIDE			
No Dwg.	Carer's Permits - Removal of 'medical' wording	None	Proceed as advertised
No Dwg.	School Keep Clear Markings – Removal of 'during term time' wording	None	Proceed as advertised
Total		44	

Drawing No: 24004 126 – 136 Farnborough Road, Farnham – FARNHAM NORTH	
Response Type	Points raised in letter, online form or E-mail (extracts from more lengthy responses with personal details removed)
Objection	Legal parking inside the double yellow lines outside houses at 126-136 Farnborough Road (Drawing 24004) is already permitted and provides sufficient space for normal cars to be so parked. I understand by removal of the parking restrictions this means removal of the double yellow lines, although the council has not explicitly stated what it intends. However if the council removes the double yellow lines in front of these houses, then it opens up parking in front of these houses to ANY TYPE OF VEHICLE. This can be from a car (which currently fits within the spacial width) to an articulated lorry which will take up half the southbound carriageway. Traffic turning right from Alma Lane already has poor visibility of what is around the corner already - so allowing large vehicles straddling the carriageway on this part of Farnborough Road cannot be viewed as contributing to road safety and easing of traffic congestion. Our neighbour has had a car written off in just such an aforesaid scenario and we have had a number of near misses.
Officer Recommendation	Having the double yellow lines in place technically means that no parking can take place in the lay-by, as it would be in breach of the 'no waiting at any time' restriction. This restriction therefore has to be removed to allow residents to park there. It has always been open to any member of the public and it will continue to be after the removal of the double yellow lines. It is therefore recommended to proceed as advertised.

Drawing No: 24008 Alma Lane j/w Heath Lane, Farnham – FARNHAM NORTH	
Response Type	Points raised in letter, online form or E-mail (extracts from more lengthy responses with personal details removed)
Objection	Since I always park by my house on Alma Lane, where else will I park if the proposal passes? Unless there is a driveway at my house, I have no objection at all. Yet I do not receive any information why you and the committee have made a decision on no waiting at any time. Need your full explanation with good reasons, please? In addition, my parents-in-law usually park by my house for visits and they both are over 80 years old and they do not walk that far to pay me and my husband a visit. Our friends often stopped by so where else will they park?
Objection	The proposed no waiting at anytime has been identified right outside 66 and 64 Alma Lane. Between neighbour and myself, we have 4 cars that we park outside our house daily. We do not have driveways so therefore NEED our parking space unless you provide driveways each so that we can park our own cars then we would not object to the proposal. What's the reason for the proposal in the first place?
Objection	I live at the address where you're proposing to put double yellow lines, but I note that there is no mention of any

	alteration to the kerb to allow our cars to be parked on the garden or considered that this property is rented from a housing association and permission is needed before our cars can be put on the garden. Who is going to pay for it to be done providing permission is granted, and right on top of Christmas! You seemed to have found the cheapest method for your purse strings but don't seem to have any consideration for mine or my family's welfare. Please take my objections into consideration before continuing with this first. If there is permission granted from both sides and the money found for the transformation of off road parking on the front garden then my objection will be reduced.
Objection	Your plan to instate no parking is right outside our son's house XX Alma Lane. We park along there every week, sometimes two or three times a week when we look after their two cats. We are both in our 80s and need to park there. My wife has recently had a knee transplant so walking is hard for her.
Support	Based on my experience at trying to get out of Heath Lane, this is an excellent proposal. All too often motorists travel along Alma Lane in excess of 40 mph, without realising there is a turning into/out of Heath Lane. The situation is made all the more perilous by cars being parked on Alma Lane opposite the exit from Heath Lane. These cars effectively reduce the width of the Alma Lane, so that there is little chance of avoiding any cars being driven up Alma Lane in excess of the speed limit.
Officer Recommendation	Parking opposite this junction has become more of an issue due to Alma Lane being slightly on an elevated level compared to Heath Lane which has an incline leading up to Alma Lane. Therefore the need to prevent parking opposite this junction is greater than those on a more even level. It was already known that residents park outside their houses located opposite the junction, and these objections have come from some of these households. Bearing in mind that the problem of parking opposite this junction was the primary reason why these restrictions were requested and subsequently taken forward, it is recommended to proceed as advertised.

Drawing No: 24018 Lower South View, Farnham – FARNHAM CENTRAL	
Response Type	Points raised in letter, online form or E-mail (extracts from more lengthy responses with personal details removed)
Objection	The current limited time parking in Lower South View is to enable visitors, tradesmen and contractors to access homes in this street. I object to making these parking bays permit holder only, as this will mean that visitors, and especially tradesmen and contractors, will be unable to park close to their destination in a street where it is often difficult to find a free space.
Objection	Myself and my fiancé have lived at the address for a number of years, when I purchased the property part of the consideration was the fact there are parking bays on the road. I would like to understand WHY the decision has been made to remove these bays without consulting the residents who it shall affect the most. My fiancé who has low blood pressure and commutes an hour each way to work, often has to carry work equipment to and from her car and

	if these bays don't exist, that could put her health at risk. It is a quiet no through road which has a number of houses without parking, so where do you suggest these people park? Some of the residents also are elderly, who rely on these spaces to park locally to their front door, I don't think it is reasonable to expect them to have to walk in the cold at the risk of their safety to alter tie parking solutions. I see no beneficial reason to remove the bays on lower south view, could I please receive a detailed reasoning behind this decision.
Objection	I object to the proposal to convert the single yellow line outside the driveway of numbers 7 and 9 while not doing the same for other driveways further along the street. This is unfair and discriminatory, smacks of partiality, and gives rise to the suspicion of giving way to lobbying. Why is it proposed to make this one change?
Objection	I have noticed your proposals to change Lower South View to permit holders only. At the moment I consider this is not necessary and request you reconsider this proposal. Lower South View has approximately 14 hours of which only two 17 and 13 do not have off street parking. The first four houses have a permit holder only bay in front of their house. The permit holder only bay is rarely used and even on a busy Saturday afternoon there are no cars using it.
Officer Recommendation	The removal of the limited waiting time will mean that visitor permits will have to be used for visitors and tradesman wishing to park in the bays. Whilst the limited waiting period does allow for more freedom for visitors, it is this exact restriction that residents have been asking to be removed following a long standing history of non residents taking up space and parking for long periods of time. Whilst visitors abusing the limited waiting period by staying beyond the allowed time can be issued with a fixed penalty notice, residents of Lower South View are understood to be fed up with the frequent abuse and as a result, they specifically requested for the all the bays to be made permit holders only (they are not being removed in their entirety as the second objection appears to refer to). Regarding the conversion of a single yellow to double yellow, the residents with this driveway specifically requested this change. We would not usually convert single yellow to double across driveways without a request from the resident. Unfortunately, additional changes cannot be made at this stage. It is recommended to proceed as advertised.

Drawing No: 24029 Alfred Road, Farnham – FARNHAM CENTRAL

Response Type	Points raised in letter, online form or E-mail (extracts from more lengthy responses with personal details removed)
Objection	There are already way too many parking restrictions on the roads around Farnham. Councils need to stop being so greedy and always targeting motorists.
Officer Recommendation	This proposal is just to make an advisory disabled bay enforceable. It is recommended to proceed as advertised.

Drawing No: 24030 Menin Way, Farnham – FARNHAM CENTRAL	
Response Type	Points raised in letter, online form or E-mail (extracts from more lengthy responses with personal details removed)
Objection	This would cause great issue to people like myself who learn in the institute Farnham music and drama. The reason for this, is that to park near this place your only available parking is on great austins, and the moment that is taken away I'm left with very few places to park, none of which close by. This is frustrating as I'll have to carry my equipment a far further distance causing great inconvenience, and I can assure you others from here can sympathise.
Objection	Comments relate to Plan: FarnhamCentral2015_2 Drwing No 3282/WAV I object to the proposed changes as they will not improve the current parking and traffic congestion at peak times. Additional improvements are required. I am a parent who travels to school by foot or bicycle and very occasionally by car. I avoid using the car as the situation at school drop off times is intolerable. It appears the proposed parking changes only address concerns about preventing rail commuters parking on part of Menin Way. Menin Way has serious problems with congestion during the school drop off times i.e. 8:15-9:00 and 3:00-4:00. During these periods this area becomes very dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists as as frustrated and angry motorists drive along pavements to get past each other and it is only a matter of time before someone is seriously injured or killed. I would propose that the whole length of Menin Way on the school side has parking restrictions from 0800-1800. This would include the current no parking sections which are currently wasted space during this period. Waiting Period 20 Mins: This needs to be reviewed further perhaps less or no waiting. The challenge here is most parking spaces are filled with waiting parents from about 2:50 as far as Great Austins and adjacent roads. So all parking spaces will be filled along Menin Way by about 1510 and congestion will not be improved by the changes. An active solution with the school is needed and perhaps a Oneway system at drop off times.
Objection	There are already so many parking restrictions in this area surely we need to have somewhere for people to be able to park other than crowded and expensive car parks, which are often full.
Officer Recommendation	The proposed 20 minute bay is specifically intended to improve the ability for parents and carers to pick up and drop off children to the school. A 20 minute waiting bay is very effective on the ground with regards to this, and has been proven to work in nearby streets. It is inevitable that by introducing a bay such as this, that long term parking will be lost. However, there has been an increase in the amount of complaints and enquiries relating to the lack of school pick up and drop off space in Menin Way, and this proposal is a solid response to this. It is therefore recommended to proceed as advertised.

Drawing No: 24023 College Gardens, Farnham – FARNHAM CENTRAL

Response Type	Points raised in letter, online form or E-mail (extracts from more lengthy responses with personal details removed)
Objection	<p>We moved to Potters Gate in 2008, on viewing the property we noticed straight away there was NO parking on this road!! Myself, my mother and my family support worker (XXXX XXXXX from Surrey County Council) were assured by XXXX XXXXXX (housing officer waverley council)that we would have 2 PERMANENT parking places in college gardens as this house was the wardens house for college gardens and it has the SIGNS for warden parking and deputy warden? Even on the day that we signed our tenancy with Mr XXXXX XXXXXX (housing management officer) we were assured again about the PERMANENT parking at college gardens. A few weeks later we were given our permits. I don't object to paying £50 a year for a permit as long as we have allocated parking in college gardens. There is VERY limited parking in Farnham town, so trying to park on West Street is impossible. My mother is 72 and my Daughter is 7 so can you guarantee our safety in trying to get home at night and that our cars won't be vandalised??.</p>
Objection	<p>I strongly object to the proposed parking changes at College Gardens. I currently have permission to park in College Gardens and have been issued permits to do so. This will be the third time that residents of X Potters Gate have had parking permissions withdrawn. Enough is enough. Parking Option 1. The previous owner of my property, a Mr XXXXX, parked his car in a purpose built garage on my property. Access to this garage via the school carpark was granted by way of a formal licence issued by Waverley/SCC in 1979. This licence has now been withdrawn. I am therefore prevented from parking my car on my property, which would be my preference. Parking Option 2. Until recently Potters Gate road had no parking restrictions on it . Parking restrictions have now been put in place. So I am now also prevented from parking on the street in front of my house. Parking Option 3. About to be withdrawn by Waverley/SCC. I have been parking my cars in College Gardens since 1997 with Waverley Council's permission. The officer in charge of parking at College Gardens at the time, XXXX XXXXX, understood my specific situation and I was given permission to park there. Informally initially, when no restrictions were in place, and formally during the period in which permits were required. I was issued 2 full time permits and 1 visitor permit.</p>
Objection	<p>I am very concerned about the reduction of available parking spaces for local residents. At present there are more spaces available than within the proposal and demand for parking is acute. There are currently 2 spaces backing on to 89 West Street at the rear of the cul-de-sac, forming 8 available spaces in all in that area. These have been omitted from the scheme which provides only for six spaces in this area. There is no obvious reason for the omission of these 2 additional spaces. Along the eastern edge of College Gardens there is currently space for at least 7 vehicles. The proposal is to reduce these to 3 plus 2 blue badge spaces. Whilst acknowledging the Council's statutory duties I would very closely question the need for 2 blue badge spaces. I am a local resident and Zone A permit holder who has parked in College gardens, every day, for 13 years. In all that time I have only ever seen one</p>

	<p>car parked with a disabled sticker (owned by the then owner of No X College Gardens , who initiated the re-designation of the former Zone A parking scheme in or about 2004 and persuaded the Council to create the current disabled bay outside that property). I question the empirical evidence upon which the need for 2 blue badge spaces is based. The effect of the scheme is to reduce bays available to local residents, who have no off street parking , from 15 spaces to 9. This is not sensible given the dearth of alternative parking within reasonable walking distance of College Gardens. The reality is that the proposal will force local residents, in practice and during controlled hours, to park in the bays in front of the UCA, a considerable walking distance away.</p>
Objection	<p>I am a joint tenant at X Potters Gate. When my daughter and I viewed the property, it was noticed there was no parking in the road. The housing officer who showed us round assured us that we had free permanent parking in College Gardens and as this property had originally been the wardens house there were in fact two named parking spaces. Whilst I have no objection to paying £50.00 a year for allocated parking. Parking in West Street is virtually impossible at all times of the day and at my age (72) I would be very unhappy walking through the streets of Farnham alone at night.</p>
Comment (Petition)	<p>A 13 signature petition was received asking for the implementation of the scheme to be delayed until the two off street car parking areas within College Gardens are implemented by Waverley Borough Council. This would significantly reduce the impact that the proposed on street parking restrictions would have on both College Gardens residents and their visitors.</p>
Officer Recommendation	<p>As Potters Gate residents are part of the Farnham Town Centre Controlled Parking Zone (Zone A) they would be eligible to apply for Zone A permits. These Zone A permits could therefore be used in any of the shared use bays planned for College Gardens. Even though any resident of Zone A can park in College Gardens with a permit, there are off street car parks planned for College Gardens that will be able to hold all cars belonging to College Gardens residents. Therefore there should not be a huge demand for the on street shared use bays in College Gardens from College Gardens residents. There are two private car parking spaces located to the rear of number 4 Potters Gate. Any parking arrangements or agreements for these two spaces will be able to continue.</p> <p>There are two off street car parking areas planned for College Gardens, one at the end of the cul-de-sac and one to the right as you enter the cul-de-sac. At this present time, final agreement for these parking areas is being obtained from Waverley Borough Council. As the planned car park at the end of the cul-de-sac uses an existing access, the parking restriction proposals have taken this into account. The access for the car parking area near to the entrance of the cul-de-sac involves the widening of an existing dropped kerb. Therefore some slight parking bay reductions are required in order to allow for this wider access to be constructed.</p> <p>Regarding the request to delay the installation of the advertised restriction changes until the off street car parks are constructed, this is something that may be possible and the Parking Team will continue to liaise with Waverley Borough Council over these planned off street parking areas and the proposed parking restriction changes, as we</p>

	<p>have been doing so up until this point.</p> <p>It is recommended to proceed with the restrictions subject to the following amendments: -</p> <p>Reduce the proposed shared use parking bay outside numbers 2 and 3 from 10m down to 5m. The reduction will be outside number 3 and the proposed adjacent double yellow lines will be extended up to the 5m bay.</p> <p>Reduce the proposed disabled parking bay outside number 5 so that it terminates on the boundary of number 4 and 5 (a reduction of approximately 2m).</p>
--	---

Drawing No: 24031 The Chantrys j/w West Street, Farnham – FARNHAM CENTRAL

Response Type	Points raised in letter, online form or E-mail (extracts from more lengthy responses with personal details removed)
Objection	You are proposing to stop parking in the immediate entrance road to The Chantrys. When I get back from work after 6pm it is currently quite difficult to find an empty parking bay. Carrying out this proposal would make it much worse. Changing the parking to "No Waiting at any time" would not help the residents in any way. It would make the few remaining parking bays very difficult to get as there are more cars and houses than parking bays. I would then have the problem of potentially having to park my car far away from my house. I propose that you make it a single yellow line - so no parking Monday to Friday during the working day. It should not matter about the evenings and the weekend. Also consider giving the resident's parking permits. Grounds for my objection: 1. It would make parking for residents more difficult as the cars that park there now would also have to park in the resident's parking bays. 2. The resident's parking bays are open to all - they are not reserved for residents in any way. 3. It is unnecessary to make it no parking at any time on the one side where residents end up having to park sometimes when the parking bays are all occupied.
Objection	We have people that work in Farnham, park in the chantrys to avoid paying parking charges, there are not enough spaces to accommodate resident parking, cars per family have increased over the years, when the estate was built it allowed for one car per household, this is not practical today. The car park at the entrance to the chantrys could be made bigger with the removal of the greenery that the council no longer keeps cut, or the removal of the vastly overgrown bush outside flats 1-11 that is now a hazard to the public as yet again the council no longer maintain it.
Support	Double yellows are needed along this stretch as parked cars cause problems at junction. In addition a large majority of the cars are not residents of the road as only seems to be a problem mon-fri.
Support	I totally agree with the double yellow lines at the bottom of the Estate it is a pity it was not done before.

Support	Park cars cause a problem when turning in and coming out + cars are Park on corner just up a little bit from entrance as well
Officer Recommendation	Parking problems on its junction with West Street and along the narrow entrance section of The Chantry's leading up to the parking areas has been raised by residents on and off for several years now. This proposal is intended to put an end to the parking problems on this entrance in its entirety, and provide a solution for an obstruction and sight line problem that the majority of residents have wanted to see resolved for some time. It is therefore recommended to proceed as advertised.

Drawing No: 24015 + 24016 Guildford Road and Forge Close, Farnham – FARNHAM CENTRAL

Response Type	Points raised in letter, online form or E-mail (extracts from more lengthy responses with personal details removed)
Objection	<p>- concern that double yellow lines on Forge Close would reduce the areas available for residents of Guildford Road and Forge Close to park. There is already limited availability on these roads as parking is already largely taken up (some of the cars parked during the day-and a few overnight-do not belong to residents). - concern that increased use of double yellow lines on Guildford Road will lead to unsafe, fast driving. The current parking of cars on Guildford Road acts as a speed control mechanism when traffic levels are lower in particular during the week day, evening and weekends. - concern that the increased use of double yellow lines will significantly increase the volume of traffic travelling down Guildford Road and increase noise pollution. - we do support the proposal to have double yellow lines on the corners of Forge Close - both at the junction with Guildford Road and at the first left bend mid-way up Forge Close. Shortage of parking spaces means that on occasion cars are left to park here which restricts access to and from the Close. In addition residents have raised the following points; - what is the overall traffic strategy for Farnham and how this proposal fits into this strategy appears unclear. Can this be clarified? - we believe the overall traffic strategy should be to introduce traffic-calming to Farnham centre and encourage through traffic to use the bypass. - Is there any data or statistics to support the current proposal? - what other options or alternatives have been considered? If so, can these be shared? - Consideration should be made to making Guildford Road between Hale Road and the junction to Forge Close one-way and restricting speed to 20mph. We will be raising our concerns to the proposal individually online in addition to submitting this letter as a group. We look forward to discussing this further and hope you will be able to provide a few dates and times so that as many of us as possible can meet to discuss this further.</p>
Objection	<p>We are objecting because; - concern that double yellow lines on Forge Close would reduce the areas available for residents of Guildford Road and Forge Close to park. There is already limited availability on these roads as parking is already largely taken up (some of the cars parked during the day and a few overnight do not belong to residents.) - concern that increased use of double yellow lines on Guildford Road will lead to unsafe, fast driving. The current</p>

	<p>parking of cars on Guildford Road acts as a speed control mechanism when traffic levels are lower in particular during the week day, evening and weekends. Guildford Road being largely a residential with lots of young families, the need for traffic calming is significant. - concern that the increased use of double yellow lines will significantly increase the volume of traffic levels on Guildford Road and increase noise pollution. - we do support the proposal to have double yellow lines on the corners of Forge Close - both at the junction with Guildford Road and at the first left bend mid-way up Forge Close. Shortage of parking spaces means that on occasion cars are left to park here which restricts access to and from the Close.</p>
Objection	<p>- double yellow lines on Forge Close will reduce the areas available for residents of Guildford Road and Forge Close to park. There is already limited availability on these roads as parking is already largely taken up (some of the cars parked during the day-and a few overnight-do not belong to residents). - there is a potential that intensifying double yellow lines on Guildford Road will lead to unsafe, fast driving. The current parking of cars on Guildford Road acts as a speed control mechanism when traffic levels are lower in particular during the week day, evening and weekends. - there is a potential that intensifying double yellow lines will significantly increase the volume of traffic travelling down Guildford Road and increase noise pollution. - i do support the proposal to have double yellow lines on the corners of Forge Close - both at the junction with Guildford Road and at the first left bend mid-way up Forge Close. Shortage of parking spaces means that on occasion cars are left to park here which restricts access to and from the Close. - serious consideration should be given to a speed-restricted one-way system (from the Homebase entrance towards the town centre). This will negate the need for intensifying double yellow lines on Guildford Road.</p>
Objection	<p>Although some of our previous parking concerns (Guildford Road and Forge Close) have been addressed by these proposals, residents of both roads have concerns with the current plans. We support the proposal to have double yellow lines on the corners of Forge Close - both at the junction with Guildford Road and at the first left bend mid-way up Forge Close. Shortage of parking spaces means that on occasion cars are left to park here which restricts access to and from the Close. However, extending these double yellow lines beyond the corners will serve no purpose other than to further reduce the number of parking spaces for Forge Close residents' visitors, and for Guildford Rd residents who currently use the close to park. And once the yellow lines are extended in Guildford Rd, residents there will increasingly have to use Forge Close for parking. I know that Guildford Rd residents have further concerns, not least wanting to know what the long term strategy for traffic in Farnham is going to be. It seems at the moment as though measures are being introduced piecemeal with residents of the two roads above likely to suffer.</p>
Objection	<p>Following your revised notice about proposed parking changes to Guildford Road and Forge Close in Farnham, residents of Guildford Road and Forge Close have again come together and expressed some concerns to the proposals set out. In short, our reaction to the proposals are; - concern that double yellow lines on Forge Close would reduce the areas available for residents of Guildford Road and Forge Close to park. There is already limited availability on these roads as parking is already largely taken up</p>

	<p>(some of the cars parked during the day and a few overnight do not belong to residents.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - concern that increased use of double yellow lines on Guildford Road will lead to unsafe, fast driving. The current parking of cars on Guildford Road acts as a speed control mechanism when traffic levels are lower in particular during the week day, evening and weekends. - concern that the increased use of double yellow lines will significantly increase the volume of traffic levels on Guildford Road and increase noise pollution. - we do support the proposal to have double yellow lines on the corners of Forge Close - both at the junction with Guildford Road and at the first left bend mid-way up Forge Close. Shortage of parking spaces means that on occasion cars are left to park here which restricts access to and from the Close. <p>In addition, residents have raised the following points;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - what is the overall traffic strategy for Farnham and how this proposal fits into this strategy appears unclear. Can this be clarified? - we believe the overall traffic strategy should be to introduce traffic-calming to Farnham centre and encourage through traffic to use the bypass. - is there any data or statistics to support the current proposal? - what other options or alternatives have been considered? If so, can these be shared? - consideration should be made to making Guildford Road between Hale Road and the junction to Forge Close one-way and restructuring speed to 20mph. <p>We will be raising our concerns to the proposal individually online in addition to submitting is letter as a group. We look forward to discussing this further and hope you will be able to provide a few dates and times so that as many of us as possible can meet to discuss this further.</p>
<p>Objection</p>	<p>Following your revised notice about proposed parking changes to Guildford Road and Forge Close in Farnham, residents of Guildford Road and Forge Close have again come together and expressed some concerns to the proposals set out.</p> <p>In short, our reaction to the proposals are;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - concern that double yellow lines on Forge Close would reduce the areas available for residents of Guildford Road and Forge Close to park. There is already limited availability on these roads as parking is already largely taken up (some of the cars parked during the day and a few overnight do not belong to residents.) - concern that increased use of double yellow lines on Guildford Road will lead to unsafe, fast driving. The current parking of cars on Guildford Road acts as a speed control mechanism when traffic levels are lower in particular during the week day, evening and weekends. - concern that the increased use of double yellow lines will significantly increase the volume of traffic levels on Guildford Road and increase noise pollution. - we do support the proposal to have double yellow lines on the corners of Forge Close - both at the junction with Guildford Road and at the first left bend mid-way up Forge Close. Shortage of parking spaces means that on

	<p>occasion cars are left to park here which restricts access to and from the Close. In addition, residents have raised the following points;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - what is the overall traffic strategy for Farnham and how this proposal fits into this strategy appears unclear. Can this be clarified? - we believe the overall traffic strategy should be to introduce traffic-calming to Farnham centre and encourage through traffic to use the bypass. - is there any data or statistics to support the current proposal? - what other options or alternatives have been considered? If so, can these be shared? - consideration should be made to making Guildford Road between Hale Road and the junction to Forge Close one-way and restructuring speed to 20mph. <p>We will be raising our concerns to the proposal individually online in addition to submitting is letter as a group. We look forward to discussing this further and hope you will be able to provide a few dates and times so that as many of us as possible can meet to discuss this further.</p>
<p>Objection</p>	<p>Following your revised notice about proposed parking changes to Guildford Road and Forge Close in Farnham, residents of Guildford Road and Forge Close have again come together and expressed some concerns to the proposals set out. In short, our reaction to the proposals are;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - concern that double yellow lines on Forge Close would reduce the areas available for residents of Guildford Road and Forge Close to park. There is already limited availability on these roads as parking is already largely taken up (some of the cars parked during the day and a few overnight do not belong to residents.) - concern that increased use of double yellow lines on Guildford Road will lead to unsafe, fast driving. The current parking of cars on Guildford Road acts as a speed control mechanism when traffic levels are lower in particular during the week day, evening and weekends. - concern that the increased use of double yellow lines will significantly increase the volume of traffic levels on Guildford Road and increase noise pollution. - we do support the proposal to have double yellow lines on the corners of Forge Close - both at the junction with Guildford Road and at the first left bend mid-way up Forge Close. Shortage of parking spaces means that on occasion cars are left to park here which restricts access to and from the Close. <p>In addition, residents have raised the following points;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - what is the overall traffic strategy for Farnham and how this proposal fits into this strategy appears unclear. Can this be clarified? - we believe the overall traffic strategy should be to introduce traffic-calming to Farnham centre and encourage through traffic to use the bypass. - is there any data or statistics to support the current proposal? - what other options or alternatives have been considered? If so, can these be shared?

	<p>- consideration should be made to making Guildford Road between Hale Road and the junction to Forge Close one-way and restructuring speed to 20mph. We will be raising our concerns to the proposal individually online in addition to submitting is letter as a group. We look forward to discussing this further and hope you will be able to provide a few dates and times so that as many of us as possible can meet to discuss this further.</p>
<p>Objection</p>	<p>Following your revised notice about proposed parking changes to Guildford Road and Forge Close in Farnham, residents of Guildford Road and Forge Close have again come together and expressed some concerns to the proposals set out. In short, our reaction to the proposals are;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - concern that double yellow lines on Forge Close would reduce the areas available for residents of Guildford Road and Forge Close to park. There is already limited availability on these roads as parking is already largely taken up (some of the cars parked during the day and a few overnight do not belong to residents.) - concern that increased use of double yellow lines on Guildford Road will lead to unsafe, fast driving. The current parking of cars on Guildford Road acts as a speed control mechanism when traffic levels are lower in particular during the week day, evening and weekends. - concern that the increased use of double yellow lines will significantly increase the volume of traffic levels on Guildford Road and increase noise pollution. - we do support the proposal to have double yellow lines on the corners of Forge Close - both at the junction with Guildford Road and at the first left bend mid-way up Forge Close. Shortage of parking spaces means that on occasion cars are left to park here which restricts access to and from the Close. <p>In addition, residents have raised the following points;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - what is the overall traffic strategy for Farnham and how this proposal fits into this strategy appears unclear. Can this be clarified? - we believe the overall traffic strategy should be to introduce traffic-calming to Farnham centre and encourage through traffic to use the bypass. - is there any data or statistics to support the current proposal? - what other options or alternatives have been considered? If so, can these be shared? - consideration should be made to making Guildford Road between Hale Road and the junction to Forge Close one-way and restructuring speed to 20mph. <p>We will be raising our concerns to the proposal individually online in addition to submitting is letter as a group. We look forward to discussing this further and hope you will be able to provide a few dates and times so that as many of us as possible can meet to discuss this further.</p>
<p>Support</p>	<p>Ref Guildford Road and Forge Close, Dwg Nos; 24015, 24016: We fully support the proposed parking restriction proposals in the two drawings and suggest that consideration be given to adding 'no waiting at any time' parking restrictions to the junction of Kimbers Lane to Guildford Road. Vehicle owners commonly park right up to the end of</p>

	the road, making access and egress from the junction difficult, especially for refuse collection vehicles and other vehicle drivers during busy traffic. Also suggest 'no waiting at any time' parking restriction be added to junction of Kimbers Lane opposite No:1 Kimbers Lane.
Support	I am writing in strong support of the proposed implementation of yellow lines to Forge Close in Farnham. The proposals will prevent inconsiderate parking on both sides of the road as you turn the corner into the close. Due to dangerous parking, the road has been made impassable on several occasions for delivery drivers & on one occasion we were unable to leave the close. We have two young children & have unfortunately had reason to call an ambulance to the close twice in the past year. Fortunately, on both occasions the ambulance was able to get to us. This might not have been the case had there been a fire & a fire engine was required to attend. The implementation of yellow lines will significantly improve safety & therefore has my support.
Comment	I support the parking restrictions, but if you are going ahead with the proposal you should implement restricted parking for permit holders only between 15 and 37 Guildford Rd, as the proposed restrictions will have an impact on the available parking which is already stretched to the limit, and a lot of the congestion during the day time is caused by people parking along this stretch for free and walking into town.
Comment	I think that the proposed double yellow lines will improve access to Forge Close for all vehicles - recently ,a car repeatedly parked right at at the bottom near the junction with Guildford Road has made turning into the close very difficult. We moved here about a year ago - our removal van was unable to come into the close due to parked cars so we welcome the yellow lines on the bends. However I am concerned that more non residents will try to park in the close in a reduced area which may cause problems for residents. It would be good if the traffic moves more freely on Guildford Road and we see fewer irate drivers.
Comment	Alternative suggestions made: - 1.) Make parking on Guildford Road, Kiln Lane and Dollis Drive resident permit holders only. 2.) Make Guildford Road one way from the Fire Station to the TA Centre. 3.) Construct a filter road to the recycling centre. 4.) Changer the signs to the town centre on the Shepherd and Flock R/A 5.) Traffic light system from the TA centre, synchronised with the lights outside the Fire Station to maintain the flow of traffic each way.
Officer Recommendation	The relatively large amount of double yellow lines proposed for Forge Close can appear excessive on a plan, but in effect, around half of the proposed double yellows are merely intended to maintain parking on one side of the road as you enter Forge Close from Guildford Road, and to keep the parking back far enough from the junction, which most of the time is the case on the ground. The other half of the proposed restrictions will see a reduction in currently unrestricted parking space. However, the sharp bend within Forge Close is impossible to negotiate for larger vehicles when parking takes place on this bend. Emergency service vehicles and in particular, fire engines, would almost certainly be prevented from accessing Forge Close if parking is all around the bend. The problem is that immediately after the sharp bend, the road becomes very wide (forming an 'S' bend) and invites parking to take place on both

	<p>sides. However, many larger vehicles would need most, if not all of this area to be clear in order to turn, which motorists wouldn't necessarily realise when parking their own relatively smaller vehicle on the 'S' bend.</p> <p>The proposals for Guildford Road are intended to be a compromise between the parking needs of the residents with properties fronting this road and also the needs of through traffic to be able to pass without delay. As part of this advertisement all properties fronting this particular part of Guildford Road were once again notified about proposed double yellow lines here. The reasoning behind the proposals was explained in the hand delivered documentation. Bearing in mind that there were 32 objections to the previous proposal to double yellow line this entire road on both sides, having only 8 objections for this proposal (two of which coming from the same household) does seem to suggest as though this current 'compromise proposal' is being accepted by the majority of Guildford Road and Forge Close residents fronting the proposed restrictions. Without some form of parking proposal for this section of Guildford Road, the delays to through traffic will continue and may even worsen in future years as vehicle numbers inevitably increase. It is therefore recommended to proceed as advertised. Should these restrictions be agreed and installed, monitoring of this location will take place to determine the effectiveness of the restrictions.</p>
--	--

Drawing No: 24037 Greenfield Road, Farnham – FARNHAM SOUTH

Response Type	Points raised in letter, online form or E-mail (extracts from more lengthy responses with personal details removed)
Objection	These changes will prevent motorists parking in this area (predominantly commuters). This proposal will most likely make this road considerably more dangerous. Currently this road is a rat run and vehicles are driven too fast. Parked vehicles create a narrowing which results in speed reduction. Clearing the road of parked vehicles will enable vehicles to drive faster increasing the risk of accidents. This road is used by children going to school. Perhaps the parking reports needs to state the strategy of where it wants commuters to park. As there is a problem to resolve.
Objection	Public transport is not frequent and limited in Farnham. Constantly restricting parking is not the solution.
Comment	Finally something being done about the road, to ensure the safety of school children using the new entrance. But what is going to be done about the cars driving over the speed limit along Greenfield Road, which continues even when school children are using it.
Officer Recommendation	Restrictions are just to prevent parking by new access to the rear of Weydon School. It is recommended to proceed as advertised.

Drawing No: 24130 Stream Farm Close j/w Frensham Road, Farnham – FARNHAM SOUTH

Response Type	Points raised in letter, online form or E-mail (extracts from more lengthy responses with personal details removed)
Support	I live on Stream Farm Close and fully support the proposal to implement double yellow lines at the entrance to the close. The current white line arrangement is ignored by drivers at the moment, particularly around school drop-off and pick-up and whenever there is a session of cub scouts or scouts at the scout hut opposite. I have witnessed a few near misses with cars turning in to the close coming down the hill from Farnham have been forced to brake hard as a car exiting the close has been forced on to the wrong side of the road by the parked cars and is waiting to exit. It is only a matter of time before there's an accident in this situation. What is also frustrating is that I have often witnessed cars parked on the white lines when just 20-30 metres further up the close it is clear. Double yellow lines will force people to park responsibly and should mitigate the accident risk in the entrance to the road.
Support	I am writing in support of the proposed new parking restrictions at the entrance to Stream Farm Close. There are often vehicles parked on the white lines. The road is narrow, and the entrance to the road is blind due to trees, the wall and other vegetation. Getting into the road from the Farnham direction is difficult anyway given the lack of visibility, and this is exacerbated when cars are parked on either side of the roads, especially at night. I am seriously concerned that there will be an accident if this is not resolved, and bear in mind that the road is often used by parents picking up their children from the nearby school. There is generally parking available further down the road which should overcome any issue of displacement. I would urge that the proposal to replace the single white lines at the Close entrance with double yellow ones is passed.
Support	I'd like to support the proposal to replace the single white lines at the mouth of Stream Farm Close with a double yellow line. The reason for this is the danger to anyone exiting the close if there are cars parked on the single white line. Cars park on this line on a regular daily basis - despite the fact that there is ample parking available further down the close.
Support	Dear Sir/Madam, I am writing to support the residents request for double yellow lines at the entrance to Stream Farm Close where it borders The Fox Pub with the Frensham Road. At the moment there is a single white line which everyone, except the residents of the close, choose to ignore. So parents dropping off and picking up at the Bourne School, parents dropping off etc at the Scout Hut opposite and patrons of the pub all park there every day. Sometimes they even park on the pavement when they could so easily just park a few metres further down into the close. This is a very busy junction at the best of times but when the white line is covered to the road it is positively dangerous. Coming out of the close you have to go into the right hand lane with the knowledge that at any time someone could be swinging blindly into the close. There have been a number of major incidents on the crossroads already and I feel it is just a matter of time before something more serious occurs. And as nearly all the activities thereabouts include children it is a real worry.

Support	I am writing in support of the proposed new parking restrictions at the entrance to Stream Farm Close. In spite of the white lines, there are often vehicles parked on these. The road is narrow, and the entrance to the road is blind due to trees, the wall and other vegetation. On a number of occasions in October alone I have been forced to brake urgently coming down the hill from Farnham to allow traffic to exit from the road before I could turn in, and in heavy traffic this poses a serious risk. This is much worse at night where vehicles are parked without lights. Leaving the Close is also problematic especially in the evening when there are cars waiting to enter the road. There is generally parking available further down the road which should overcome any issue of displacement. I would urge that the proposal to replace the single white lines at the Close entrance with double yellow ones is passed.
Support	As a resident of Stream Farm Close, I am very keen that this proposal is implemented as the number of cars that currently park at the end of the road means that it can be very difficult and dangerous trying to get in and out of the Close. There is plenty of parking further down the Close where the road is wider.
Support	Lodging support for double yellow lines at the entrance to Stream Farm Close. Single white lines do not prevent vehicles parking for short and long periods, possibly whilst in the Fox Pub or at the Scout Hut as you can expect to find vehicles there in the evening when the 2 above venues are in use. I don't recall ever seeing lights left on at night on these vehicles either. Regularly, whilst travelling down the hill at 30mph from the direction of town, there is an impatient driver travelling far too close behind. If the A287 is clear ahead, vehicles will overtake as I start turning left into the Close. If there's a vehicle parked on the white lines and a vehicle exiting, there is no-where to go as the exiting vehicle will be using the right lane. I would have to stop on the main road to let them out and there would be no time at all to indicate this to the vehicle/s behind - there are several trees and a wall, plus a curve in the Close itself, that doesn't allow clear sight of the area. I've had several close shaves here over the 22+ years residing in the Close. I see double yellow lines at the Bourne shops, at the entrance to School Lane and start of Lodge Hill Road and think we should also be safe. There's always plenty of parking further down our road which could be utilised instead of parking at the entrance.
Support	Dear Sirs, I am writing to strongly support the proposal to replace the single white lines at the entrance to Stream Farm Close with double yellow ones. The reasons for this are as follows: 1. The current white lines allow people to park right at the entrance to the close. Nearly all of the parking occurs at night so without lights on and the numbers of cars parking means that they are parking closer and closer to the entrance. 2. Whenever I have seen vehicles parked in this manner there has always been plenty of space available to park less than 20 metres further down the Close - which would be a lot safer! 3. The "blind" nature of the entrance to Stream Farm Close when approached from Farnham direction due in part to the tall and mature trees, the wall and other vegetation make it more dangerous. When vehicles are parked in this manner the risk of collisions with vehicles exiting the Close is far greater as the exiting vehicles are forced to drive on the right. 4. The Scout Hut opposite means that those vehicles that may be hit will often be carrying very young children - not a risk I expect the council will want to take nor is one that as residents we want to bear. I hope each of these points shows clearly why we need to stop the parking towards the entrance of the close.

Support	1. The incidence of vehicles parked on the current white lines continues with regular frequency, largely, but not exclusively at times of activity nearby (The Fox pub; scout hut & South Farnham Infants School). This includes parking right up to the entrance of the road (south side). After dark this is particularly dangerous. 2. I have no objection to parking in the road, simply that it should be away from the junction. 3. The entrance to and exit from Stream Farm Close is narrow and with the bridge wall on the north side sight lines coming south on the A287 into the close is restricted. Equally exiting from the road also has sight problems, especially, if, because of parked cars it is necessary to approach the junction on the wrong side of the road. 4. Cars parked near the junction could also provide difficulties for emergency vehicles turning into the close, particularly fire engines.
Support	We have recently moved to Stream Farm Close and have already noticed that people are frequently parking on the single white lines at the end of the close, particularly at night time (presumably pub customers). This presents a danger to drivers approaching from the Farnham direction as visibility is poor when entering the close.
Support	I strongly support the case to implement double yellow lines to the entrance end of Stream Farm Close as I have witnessed a number of dangerous incidents due to people parking too close to the entrance of the road. On many occasions cars parked on the left side of the road result in cars exiting the road reaching the end on the wrong side, blocking the entrance into Stream Farm Close to traffic coming down the hill from Farnham and turning left into the road. There are usually lots of spaces further down Stream Farm Close where these cars could park, eradicating the danger from the entrance to the close. On many occasions when I have been nearing the exit of the close, and by necessity have been on the right hand side of the close due to having to pass the parked cars on the left, I have had to endure the fright of cars turning into the close straight towards me whilst not expecting me to be on their side. I imagine this is equally as frightening for the cars turning into the close. I believe the double yellow lines would completely resolve this danger, and would like to add that I DO NOT in any way support clearing any trees or walls from the entrance to the close to make visibility clearer as this would not be necessary if the double yellow lines were in place.
Support	I support the proposals for Stream Farm Close. As a resident I am aware of the impact that the frequent parking near the junction can have of getting in or out of the road. This often occurs in the evening when pubgoers leave them overnight.
Support	The proximity of Stream Farm Close to The Fox Pub, Scout Hut and South Farnham Infants School means many car drivers park their vehicles in this road on a daily basis. Unfortunately, car drivers often park so close to the junction that Stream Farm Close effectively becomes a single carriageway at its mouth. This represents a serious safety hazard as vehicles exiting Stream Farm Close have to drive around the parked vehicles and approach the junction on the wrong side of the road and are unable to see cars turning in owing to the wall on the corner, trees and other vegetation. Vehicles entering Stream Farm Close, particularly those driving south down the hill (on Frensham Road), have restricted vision entering the Close. There is an inherent danger of head-on collision caused entirely by parked vehicles so close to the junction. Safer parking is available all the way along Stream Farm Close but drivers prefer to park as close to the junction as possible to save walking any extra distance.

	Owing to the number of very young schoolchildren crossing at the mouth of Stream Farm Close, and also young children crossing to/from the Scout Hut, there is a terrible accident waiting to happen unless DOUBLE YELLOW LINES are applied which is why I GIVE MY SUPPORT.
Support	This is a junction with the increasingly busy A287 road. There are white lines at present intended to keep the junction clear but these are often ignored, making it hazardous both for drivers leaving Stream Farm Close and those turning off the A287 road. Visibility is poor for both sets of drivers because of vegetation and the parapet of the adjacent stream bridge. This is particularly hazardous situation at night because the parked vehicles (often traders vans) are invariably without lights. The main culprits seem to be customers of the Fox public house where part of the car park is sometimes unusable after heavy rainfall. It is important for this junction to be kept clear especially for the safety of all road users and pedestrians. An important factor is that young children are often in the vicinity in the evenings on their way to or from the Scouts Hall opposite. Another factor is the high speed of much of the traffic on the A287 road now that there are no Police checks and the previous volunteer wardens have disbanded, largely I understand because of abuse received from motorists on the A287. I also note that there are invariably spare parking spaces along Stream Farm Close away from the junction. Although not specifically caused by parking there have been a number of minor accidents at this junction both on the A287 and on Stream Farm Close. Clear access is essential from both directions.
Support	I strongly believe that the cars which park at the beginning of Stream Farm Close, adjacent to The Fox public house, constitute a clear traffic hazard. Turning left into SFC from a stream of traffic on Fox Hill can be extremely dangerous if another car is leaving the close on the wrong side of the road because of these parked cars. I have often had to stop suddenly when turning into the close to avoid this situation. Any traffic (too close?????) behind me is then obliged to take evasive action to prevent a collision. It seems to me that replacing the existing white lines with double yellow lines at the entrance to Stream Farm Close would solve this problem and make it safer for everyone.
Support	I fully support this proposal. About a year ago ALL the residents of Stream Farm Close signed a petition requesting these measures. Despite the presence of "advisory" white lines these are frequently ignored and vehicles are often parked in at the entrance to the Close - often at night and without lights. I have many photographs of such incidences. The entrance to the Close is "blind" when approached from Farnham due to the trees, other vegetation and wall so if a vehicle is parked on the white lines on the "pub side of the close" an exiting vehicle as to pass on the wrong side of the road so risking head on collision with an entering vehicle. I have personally nearly had an accident here on several occasions. On EVERY occasion when vehicles have been parked on the white lines there has been plenty of spare parking available no more than 20 meters further down the Close and therefore there is NO issue with displacement parking and it is simply that the drivers are too lazy to walk an additional 20 meters. On a recent occasion the police were called to attendance when several vehicles were parked in such a manner and I believe that this proposal also has their specific support.
Support	I am writing to confirm support for yellow lines to the entrance of the road. I have asked the Fox pub, scouts & local school on frequent occasions not to park at the top of the road. When this occurs the left hand exit lane on exiting

	becomes blocked & as a result you are forced to exit on the wrong side of the road sometimes meeting a car head on that is entering the road from the hill. Also as has happened to me on more than one occasion, I have had to stop on the main road at the junction having been prevented from turning left into the close as a car is trying to exit, again on the wrong side of the road. I have felt for a long time that there is a serious accident waiting to happen simply because motorists cannot be bothered to park sensibly or safely. I know that the highway code states, 'do not stop or park within 10 metres of a junction'. This is completely ignored and is putting residents of this close at risk. To conclude the white lines at present are I believe advisory but are completely ignored on most occasions.
Support	I am very much in support of this application. Whilst the parking on the existing white line does not occur all the time, it does happen frequently, often in connection with the nearby scout hut, school or pub. The road is quite narrow at the junction and when cars park they do so right up to the junction and it becomes difficult for cars to exit without completely blocking the entrance into the road, or for those exiting the road to see the cars just entering before moving out to pass the parked cars. Added to this the angle into the road is such that this is not immediately obvious to cars turning left into the road until they are just about to turn in, making an accident more likely. I believe that cars parking on the white line makes it very difficult for larger vehicles such as rubbish collection, delivery vehicles, emergency vehicles etc to enter the road without driving on the opposite pavement. I note that in almost all cases when cars park on the white line, there is space further down the road where cars could park much more safely.
Support	I wish to express my strong support for the proposal for parking restrictions at the entrance to Stream Farm Close. I have no objection to parking in the road but it should be away from the junction. The entrance to and exit from Stream Farm Close is narrow and with the bridge wall on the north side sight lines into and from the close is restricted. Cars parked near the junction could also provide difficulties for emergency vehicles turning into the close, particularly fire engines.
Support	The proximity of Stream Farm Close to The Fox Pub, Scout Hut and South Farnham Infants School means many car drivers park their vehicles in this road on a daily basis. Unfortunately car drivers often park so close to the junction that Stream Farm Close effectively becomes a single carriageway at its mouth.
Support	I wish to endorse the application by the residents of Stream Farm Close for the provision of double yellow lines at the road entrance.
Officer Recommendation	It is recommended to proceed as advertised.

Drawing No: 24117 Courts Hill Road, Haslemere - HASLEMERE

Response Type	Points raised in letter, online form or E-mail (extracts from more lengthy responses with personal details removed)
Objection	Current levels of on street car parking along Courts Hill Road does not cause significant issues for either residents

	or traffic given the road type and amount of traffic flow even at peak rush hour times.
Officer Recommendation	It is recommended to proceed as advertised.

Drawing No: 24117 Hill Road, Haslemere - HASLEMERE

Response Type	Points raised in letter, online form or E-mail (extracts from more lengthy responses with personal details removed)
Comment	I fully support the changes in the area of Hill Road but feel that there has been one problem overlooked. The stretch of road opposite Dene Close is on the brow of the hill and opposite a junction. Cars are frequently parked there by users of the railway station and others, seriously obstructing traffic during the working day. I have witnessed many near collisions. The Highway Code is clear in stating that cars are not to be parked in such a position but it appears that there is no force of law behind such a code without separate parking restrictions.
Officer Recommendation	Additional restrictions cannot be considered at this stage in relation to this particular proposal for Hill Road. It is therefore recommended to proceed as advertised.

Drawing No: 24054 Popes Mead, Haslemere - HASLEMERE

Response Type	Points raised in letter, online form or E-mail (extracts from more lengthy responses with personal details removed)
Objection	We would like to object to the removal of the parking space bay opposite numbers 3 and 4 Popes Mead, Haslemere as there is a shortage of spaces in ratio to the number of permits as it is. There seems to be a disconnect of information between Surrey CC and Waverley parking team, there are clear rules to the ownership of residents parking permits and the ability to use the permit holder bays. There had previously been an issue with a 'rental' tenant of 56 popes mead who wished to use THIS access as well as having 'TWO parking permits AND an additional off-road garage parking space'. The removal of the space is a NON-ISSUE now as the 'actual' owner of the property has returned to live there some 9 months or so ago. The owner wanted to use his courtyard as a garden not a car park and they applied for and now have a single road parking permit to go with their off-road garage; a solution everyone is happy with. Please also bear in mind that the car parked in front of the gates (95% of the time) IS the owners car - contrary to your reasons for wanting to remove the space. If this space is to be removed then Waverley parking team will have to enforce the two off-road space rule and remove the owners parking permit - which seems pretty pointless.
Officer	If a resident has one off street car parking space and one vehicle, then they are not entitled to a resident permit.

Recommendation	However, if a resident has one off street car parking space and two vehicles then they can apply for one resident permit. The permit allocation for the property in question will be checked with Guildford Borough Council. However, regarding the parking proposal, if double yellow lines are installed across the drive as planned then the resident owner of this driveway entrance will not be able to park in front of it either. The lines will prevent all parking. No objection was received from the resident owner of the driveway entrance so it has to be assumed that they are in favour of this proposal. It is recommended to proceed as advertised.
-----------------------	--

Drawing No: 24079 Scizdons Climb, Godalming – GODALMING NORTH

Response Type	Points raised in letter, online form or E-mail (extracts from more lengthy responses with personal details removed)
Objection	We have two cars yellow lines in our road would mean we could not park one of them as only have one parking space and we have two small children , this would make our life very difficult , just leave the road as it is
Support	Parking restriction on the lower half of this road will allow for safer access for residents and ensure access for emergency services if required.
Support	Great to see this is going to take place. It has become very difficult and at times dangerous to drive up this road as people double park. When ambulances have been up in the past there has been a worry that they wouldn't have access because of this, so very happy to see this will happen.
Support	Support parking proposal in Scizdons Climb. Oppose restrictions on Cattershall lane opposite Langham park as this will just push commuters to other area and roads.
Support	Very much in favour of the yellow lines up Scizdons Climb. People walking to the train station and working locally regularly double park up this road, restricting access to the farm at the top and to emergency vehicles that may, and have in the past needed access. Some residents even struggle to get their own cars up and down the road, and have to weave between vehicles. Coming up the hill is particularly dangerous. The double yellow lines opposite the bottom of Scizdons Climb also need remarking as cars are parking on them. Cars are being parked directly opposite the end of the road, pushing traffic into the middle of the road to get around them which makes pulling out of Scizdons Climb more dangerous.
Officer Recommendation	The four support responses seem to reflect a majority view. Therefore despite the one objection regarding the loss of on street space, which is inevitable with double yellow lines, it has to be assumed that the majority of residents are in favour of this proposal. It is therefore recommended to proceed as advertised.

Drawing No: 24079 Langham Close j/w Catteshall Lane, Godalming – GODALMING NORTH	
Response Type	Points raised in letter, online form or E-mail (extracts from more lengthy responses with personal details removed)
Objection	The section of highway under consideration is directly outside our home (XX Langham Close) and our property does not currently benefit from off street parking. We are currently waiting for formal approval of our application for a dropped kerb (vehicle crossover) with Surrey County Council. Our primary concern is that the planned no waiting zone could prevent our application being granted, which would leave us with no parking near our house. We feel that our application is consistent with the aims of the scheme (to allow better visibility along the road), and so would hope that the two can be implemented simultaneously. Our secondary concern is that the "no waiting zone" is going to be extended really quite far down the road, which reduces visitor parking. Our preference would be for the no parking zone to finish at or before the boundary of XX Langham Close nearest to Langham Close. When combined with our dropped curb (assuming that the application is granted) this should allow ample line-of-sight to those coming out of Langham Close.
Support	I strongly support these proposed parking restrictions. It will increase road safety for all residents/visitors of Langham Close when attempting to pull out onto Catteshall Lane. Visibility is practically non-existent at the moment, you have to pull out into the oncoming lane of traffic to be able to see.
Officer Recommendation	The proposed double yellow lines will in no way affect the application for a dropped kerb for the objecting resident's property. Only marked parking bays are affected by dropped kerbs. The long extent of the proposed double yellow lines was necessary to both significantly improve sight lines for this junction, as per residents' requests, but to also cover other entrances/accesses along this particular part of Catteshall Lane. It is therefore recommended to proceed as advertised.

Drawing No: 24083 Peperharow Road, Godalming – GODALMING NORTH	
Response Type	Points raised in letter, online form or E-mail (extracts from more lengthy responses with personal details removed)
Comment	The plan shows revocation of existing restrictions across a couple of properties only. Could this be extended to incorporate other properties that also have a drop kerb along the same row of terraces?
Officer Recommendation	The proposed revocation was following specific requests from residents fronting these properties. The reduction here was the maximum possible in order to still prevent parking within 10m from the junction with Dean Road, therefore a continuation of this reduction further along was not deemed to be feasible. It is recommended to proceed as advertised.

No Drawing - The Mint and Cow Lane, Godalming – GODALMING NORTH	
Response Type	Points raised in letter, online form or E-mail (extracts from more lengthy responses with personal details removed)
Support	Most of the properties at 'The Mint, Godalming' have no off street parking and therefore have no option other than to park their cars on the surrounding streets including Station Street and Mint Street, therefore it is a necessity that the properties at 'The Mint' have access to parking on these roads, otherwise the nearest free option to park their cars is over half a mile away from their homes which is not practical. I therefore strongly support this amendment.
Comment	Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments. Of course it's entirely reasonable and fair for residents of the Mint and Cow Lane to have access to residents' parking permits - indeed I think we were all surprised that these roads had not been included along with Station Rd and Mill Lane etc so I support the proposal. I am however concerned with the actual amount of parking spaces available to go around all the "M" area as the space is not infinite. I would very much like the council to consider each household being only entitled to apply for one permit per household. This would mean that there is more to go round and would ease the overcrowding. My second comment of a general nature is that the timing for residents' only parking be from 8 am to 7 pm as I think that more realistic than 6 pm - that extension would afford more time to get home and parked before it becoming a free for all. Best wishes and thank you.
Comment	It seems unfair to exclude The Mint and Cow Lane from the zone M parking scheme. However, there are already many more permits issued than there are parking spaces. This is going to get worse as, under the current scheme, the 14 new properties being built will each be entitled to a permit. There is an equitable solution, which also future proofs the scheme. Allow The Mint and Cow Lane to join the scheme, however change the zone M scheme so that residents are only allowed ONE permit per household - and are not entitled to a permit if they already have an off-street parking space (although are entitled to visitors permits). This seems reasonable as we are only a 3 minute walk from the train station. If this change is not made the scheme will no longer be workable once the 14 new properties are occupied. You did state in the original consultation that you would review the number of permits issued if needed - it is now needed. Also I'd suggest that the number of visitor permits allowed per annum is reduced to 60 to prevent abuse, and that consideration is giving to introducing parking spaces (under zone M) to Church Street.
Officer Recommendation	It remains a possibility that the maximum number of permits available to residents using permit zone M could be reduced in the future if complaints regarding a lack of available space or the scheme being 'oversold' arise. However, at present there are no plans to change the permit allocation as the majority of residents appear to be happy with the scheme and the permit arrangement. It is recommended to proceed as advertised.

Drawing No: 24070 The Paddock j/w The Drive, Godalming – GODALMING SOUTH, MILFORD AND WITLEY	
Response Type	Points raised in letter, online form or E-mail (extracts from more lengthy responses with personal details removed)
Support	This restriction will help to make it safer to exit The Paddock for the hour or so morning and afternoon around school drop off when in a vehicle. Currently this is frequently rendered dangerously unsighted by parking to the junction edge. Accidents have occurred. It will only however help if it is enforced. Additionally, the restriction as proposed will simply push traffic further down The Paddock where there is already persistent parking on the pavement which precedes the blind corner to the left on entering The Paddock and along the road around the bend which results in vehicles, and more worryingly, pedestrians being obliged to walk on the outside of parked cars around that blind corner on the wrong side of the road.
Support	Whilst we fully support the proposal to replace existing white lines with double yellow lines on the corner where The Paddock meets The Drive, we feel that this proposal does not go far enough. A small minority of St Edmunds parents park dangerously and illegally at the first t junction in The Paddock where the road splits left to 20+ houses and right to the 4 in the little cul de sac to the side of 30 The Paddock. The parking is often diagonally across the corners on either side, frequently with 2 or sometimes 4 wheels on the pavement. This makes crossing as pedestrians and driving as residents extremely hazardous for all concerned. It also frequently means that pedestrians are forced into walking in the road around this "blind" corners due to parked cars blocking the pavement. We feel very strongly that there is a need for double yellow lines on the corners of this junction too. This will improve visibility and make all concerned safer.
Support	I support the proposal to paint yellow lines at the junction of The Paddock and The Drive, but am also concerned about the area around the T Junction where the Paddock road splits. People frequently park on or very close to these corners, restricting views and access at school pick up and drop off times.
Comment	I support the 'no waiting' proposal for the entrance to The Paddock and The Drive. However, we already have parents parking on the white lines on the corner of the road, contrary to Rule 243 of the Highway Code. I would request that lines are also positioned at the Y junction where The Paddock splits as cars frequently park here preventing large vans and lorries, and more importantly emergency vehicles, from accessing houses further down The Paddock. It is to be hoped that proper enforcement of any parking rules is ensured as it seems that a vocal minority of parents do not believe that the rules/law applies to them. Rule 244 regarding parking on the pavement is also routinely ignored by parents dropping their children off at St Edmund's School.
Comment	While I am pleased we are getting double yellow lines at this junction as it is a key priority for us to turn out of our road into The Drive safely, I feel they should be extended to the t junction going into the left and right hand sides of the Paddock as well. On a regular basis cars from out of the area park and block this road (photos have been sent to the police) during school drop off and pick up. It is not only dangerous for children but emergency vehicles would

	not be able to get through.
Officer Recommendation	The proposed restrictions cannot be extended at this stage. It is recommended to proceed as advertised.

Drawing No: 24072 Brighton Road, Godalming – GODALMING SOUTH, MILFORD AND WITLEY

Response Type	Points raised in letter, online form or E-mail (extracts from more lengthy responses with personal details removed)
Objection	There is no logic in only granting part of the street permit parking. In doing this, the problems that you hope to alleviate for those residents who you are proposing to give permits to, simply pushes the problem further up the road . Basically it needs to be all or nothing. All of Brighton Road needs to be granted permit parking to give us all a fair chance to park our cars. The permit parking which has been granted in Croft Street / Latimer Road / Town end street has already had a negative impact for those of us living near the top of Brighton Road and this will simply make it even more difficult for us. The general feeling on Brighton Road is that Waverley use the road as a cash machine and take advantage of what is a very already a very tricky situation for the residents given that parking is getting increasingly more difficult and there are no reasonable alternatives for us if we are unable to park in the parking bays. Please grant all of Brighton Road permit parking.
Objection	Although I object to the newly proposed permit-only parking on Brighton Road, it is only on the basis that the proposal appear to be ill-considered in relation to the remainder of Brighton Road. If the restrictions were taken further up Brighton Road to include the bays between the recreation area and the church, then I would support the proposal. The permit-only restrictions have been creeping up from town over recent years, for example the recent addition of Latimer Road, and the parking on the upper area of Brighton Road has been worsening as a result. The parking is very limited and far outweighed by the number of houses on the road, and associated cars. The parking is often used by commuters, shoppers and dog walkers, making it even more oversubscribed. The new proposals on the lower area of Brighton Road will have a negative impact on the parking further up Brighton Road, which is already very limited. We should be grateful if the upper area of Brighton Road could be added to the proposals and adopted as a permit-only parking area.
Objection	I live at XX Brighton Road. My property does not qualify for a permit as the permit area stops just a few doors down from me. Parking at the property is already inadequate and the introduction of permits for part of Brighton Road only means that the limited number of spaces available for those such as myself a few doors away will be greatly reduced and of the spaces left, there will be significantly increased demand. Please include my property in the permit zone!!!!!! Please!!
Objection	I live at number XXX Brighton Road. You have recently sent us a letter regarding proposed changes to make the parking bays further down Brighton Road for residents permits only. The bays towards the top (where I live) are not

	included in these proposals. This means that the cars that can no longer use the permit holder only parking, further down the road, will be pushed up into the already inadequate bays at the top of Brighton Road. I request that you make the parking bays at the top of Brighton Road permit holder only as well.
Objection	Dear Sirs, I am a Brighton Road resident, located south from the proposed changes on Brighton Road to change several parking bays to residents permit only. There is currently a significant shortfall of parking for residents along the Brighton Road. I am concerned that the implementation of permit bays in the proposed location only will result in those people who are no longer able to park moving further south along the road into the already inadequate parking bays provided outside our properties. I would suggest that a solution would be to provide residents permit parking bays along the whole of Brighton Road to help mitigate and alleviate the current parking pressures. In addition, the bays are currently constrained with triangular traffic islands, the shape of which results in one fewer parking space being provided per bay. If these were rectangular strips more cars would be capable of parking along the same stretch of road. Also, it could be argued the parking bay which ends to the front of 181/183 Brighton Road could be extended to the front of 185-189 Brighton Road to provide further parking whilst still providing sufficient sight lights for cars to enter and exit the car park located between No.s 189 and 201. Currently cars park there regularly despite the double yellow lines so extending the bay and providing allocated parking would prevent unsafe illegal parking in this location.
Objection	We have received a letter regarding proposed permit holders parking restrictions on Brighton Road. I was very pleased to see this as we live with a chronic shortage of parking and it is a daily stress with a family trying to find somewhere to park day and night. We get penalised by our own council that doesn't provide adequate parking by being issued parking fines for stopping on the yellow lines when we have nowhere else to park. It has recently become much worse - a mixture of multi car households moving in and a constant stream of workmen using the bays during the daytime. Many new cars are using the bays because of the introduction of permit only parking on Latimer Road, Carlos Street and Townend Street. Having looked closer at the proposed changes I was appalled to see that you are only proposing it for the bays further down the road so WE will have the overspill added onto our parking bays further up. How can you be proposing it for one set of bays and not all? What is the logic behind this decision and why are the bays towards the top of Brighton Road not included in the propositions?
Objection	I am deeply concerned about the proposals to restrict parking further down Brighton Road to resident permit holders. I live at XXX Brighton Road with my husband and our five month old twins. It is already challenging for us to find a parking space within close proximity of our house, which has double yellow lines immediately outside. Getting to the car involves me putting one twin in a sling and carrying the other - an arrangement which is only possible for a walk of a short distance. Further restrictions on parking on Brighton Road will limit our parking possibilities to Crownpits Lane and further up Brighton Road. However, I am sure that these locations will suffer from increased overcrowding resulting from displacement from the new restrictions. The proposal is intended to deal with the problem of displacement from existing restrictions, yet I expect it will cause further displacement elsewhere and therefore not be a total solution. It strikes me that it is solving one problem and creating another. On the occasions when it is not

	<p>possible for us to park on Brighton Road or Crownpits Lane we normally resort to parking on Grosvenor Road - a location which it is not possible for me to reach on my own with our babies. This effectively renders me house-bound. I don't know what I'd do in the event of an emergency that required me to use the car when it is parked that far away. I'm very concerned that this will be a more frequent occurrence if the current proposals are enacted. I urge the council to reconsider its proposals or else to extend the restricted area to include the upper part of Brighton Road and the section of Crownpits Lane opposite Crownpits Green, and to provide single permits to all local residents. Without such an extension I, and I'm sure many other neighbours, will be severely disadvantaged. Providing one permit to all residents who lack off-street parking would be the fairest way of allocating access to much needed parking. Finally I would like to log that the restrictions are proposed for the hours of 8.00am to 6.00pm - but parking is most restricted after 6.00pm, not during the day. A survey of the area at different times of the day and week would back this up. I sincerely hope my concerns will be taken seriously, so that my family is not further disadvantaged by the difficult parking situation on Brighton Road. I will be copying my response to my local councillor.</p>
Objection	<p>Please kindly note that it is so difficult to park on Brighton Road and the new rules creating residents permits for the residents lower down and not from further up Brighton road is not fair. We cannot park when we have heavy items to carry into our homes, builders refuse to do our work due to lack of parking and constant parking tickets for them. Please give us a resident permit (even one will do for those who are prepared to pay) per household. I would pay for a permit. Many of us are considering leaving Brighton road for the lack of parking alone.</p>
Objection	<p>I object to the proposal for residential permits in Brighton Road, as I do not believe that it will improve the parking situation in the road. There are already too few spaces for the number of homes in the area, which permitting will not solve. Additionally, the current parking restrictions are not enforced, such as double yellow lines, which makes the parking situation bad in Brighton Road, obscuring the view of traffic turning out of Crownpits, and blocking the passing place in the lower part of the road. Improving the parking situation in Brighton Road could be achieved by enforcing the current restrictions more regularly. Additionally, permit restrictions reduce flexibility for visitors of residents, despite weekend parking not proving to be that difficult. In summary, I do not believe the use of permits will improve the parking situation and so do not support the proposal. It will not mean that residents have a better chance of parking appropriately, and so parking on double yellow lines will continue, and this seems a bigger issue in the area. I believe that proper or at least improved enforcement of the existing parking restrictions will improve the parking situation in the area more effectively.</p>
Objection	<p>I am writing to strongly object to the proposed parking restrictions on lower Brighton Road up to number 80. There is currently a massive shortage of parking provision for existing residents on the upper section of the Road. I am very concerned that by introducing restrictions lower down will push more cars into the already inadequate bays that we can rarely park in as it is. This exact situation occurred when you introduced parking permits along Townend St, Latimer and Croft Roads with more cars parking on the lower parts of Brighton Rd. I would strongly urge you to consider making all of the bays on Brighton Road permit holders only to allow those who live here access to our</p>

	homes during the day. The situation at the moment is already close to ridiculous especially those of us with small children. I currently have to compete with dog walkers, second cars, and commuters for parking spaces and this situation is only set to get worse if your proposals go through. Many thanks for your consideration.
Objection	I live in the Brighton Road and do not agree with the new plans for residents parking. First of all it's extremely unfair to split the road up like this and could cause bad feeling amongst its residents. At the moment we park in the Brighton Road and Crownpits Lane and have done so for some time. It seems to work for everyone and has done for a lot of years. I think that doing what is planned will move whatever problem there is further up the road and compound the problem. Issuing resident parking permits for everyone who lives in the Brighton Road and don't have Parking facilities, thereby enabling them to park in the Brighton Road and Crownpits Lane is fair and just for all.
Support	This is pretty much what was asked for several years ago when we were concerned by the misuse of Brighton Road by HGVs. We managed to get a parking 'buffer zone' with kerb 'buildouts' and parking spaces between, which prevented HGVs from mounting the pavement to pass each other on this narrow 'B' road. There are three schools, (Primary and Junior) adjacent to Busbridge Church and whatever is finally done, the safety of these children should take a very high priority. Slightly off the point perhaps .. While signage 'UNSUITABLE FOR HGVs' is displayed it is routinely disregarded - perhaps this should be passed to the Local Committee for investigation;- I 'hear' there's a 'Guildford Transport Association' which pays to be allowed to behave in this way ,,.,,,., maybe not directly connected with parking but I shan't be unhappy if it's included if it has relevance.
Support	We fully support the proposed parking restrictions. We would ask that each household is given a number of visitor permits per year for visitors/ workmen etc. that are only staying for a very short while. For example, it is not proportionate for them to use a £2 visitor permit for only half an hour.
Support	I am very much in favour of the scheme. The recent issuing of temporary waivers to some of the residents of Brighton Road have proven that there is still considerable availability within Zone N during the day to accommodate this. My one observation is that within the proposed area (up to 85 and 88 on either side of the road) there are many houses with driveways / hardstanding for parking and therefore I wonder if they should not have PRIORITY to take part in the scheme.
Comment	I note that from 42 to 84 Brighton Road, Parking Bays will have Permit Holders Only Restrictions implemented in order to deter none resident parking. Being resident at XXX Brighton Road, we already suffer from none residents parking and forcing residents to seek parking elsewhere. How will this new scheme help (or hinder) us?
Comment	The Brighton Road has many restrictions on it already, but I wonder whether they are of any value as people regularly park on sections where restrictions are in place, sometimes well onto the pavement and they appear to do so without any fear of action to stop them. There seems to be no point in painting on all these lines unless they are enforced.
Comment	There is a plan before the council to make parking in the middle part of Brighton Road "residents parking only". This may well be a sensible idea, however it will drive parking further up Brighton Road where residents have very few open bays in which to park. I would like to propose that the parking bays along the stretch of road along which my

	home is situated is made "residents parking only" so that there is a better chance of the residents along my part of the road being able to park in front of their homes.
Comment	I have a toddler and will soon also have a baby, I find that parking is bad enough that sometimes I am walking quite far to get from my car to my house, which will become an absolute nightmare once the baby arrives. That means a food shop is out of the question as it is not safe to be trekking back and forth leaving two children unattended. Now this is just about expected due to the fact there's no parking restrictions, but if you are now proposing I have to pay to have this problem, I will hugely object due to the fact that it would not be fair to have to pay annually to not have a space to park outside my house- which implementing permits would not just suddenly solve. People still need their cars, and making them pay will not reduce the problem of a lack of spaces generally, for the number of residents living here.
Comment	I would like to request that our parking bays from 163 Brighton Road upwards should be made permit holder only. We have received a letter regarding the proposed changes to the parking bays further down Brighton Road. If our bays are not changed to permit holder only as well then the cars that can no longer use the permit holder only parking further down Brighton Road will be pushed up into our bays and we can rarely park in front of our houses as it is! Please include us up the hill as well!
Officer Recommendation	<p>All of the 11 objections received (2 of which from the same household) came from properties beyond the cut off point for eligible properties. There are around 85 Brighton Road properties beyond the cut off point and all of these were letter dropped about the proposals and were also given details regarding the properties that are eligible for permits. Bearing in mind that the majority of these properties do not have off street parking, objections relating to the exclusion of these properties and the parking lay-bys outside 139 to 183 were expected.</p> <p>There is around a 200m walking distance between the proposed 'permit holders only' lay-bys and the unrestricted lay-bys outside numbers 139 to 183. However, they are far out of sight of each other due to the large bend in this part of Brighton Road. In itself, this is a short distance to cover, but it is not known if this additional distance would be a tipping point for non residents to park and walk into the town.</p> <p>Taking into account the extensive letter drop that was carried out, it would be difficult to justify not proceeding with this scheme based on a relatively small number of objections from properties outside of the scheme area. Even including all the comments received, as some of which suggest extending the scheme also, it has to be assumed that the vast majority of the properties beyond the cut off point are content with the proposed restrictions and the cut off point for permit eligibility.</p> <p>It is recommended to proceed as advertised. However, should a displacement of non resident parking to the lay-bys outside numbers 139 to 183 be realised, and subsequently complaints received about such proven displacement, then it can certainly be considered as part of the 2016 Waverley Parking Review to include these lay-</p>

bys and all remaining Brighton Road properties in the zone N permit scheme.

Drawing No: 24072 Underhill Close, Godalming – GODALMING SOUTH, MILFORD AND WITLEY

Response Type	Points raised in letter, online form or E-mail (extracts from more lengthy responses with personal details removed)
Support	We fully support the proposed parking restrictions. We would ask that each household is given a number of visitor permits per year for visitors/ workmen etc. that are only staying for a very short while. For example, it is not proportionate for them to use a £2 visitor permit for only half an hour.
Officer Recommendation	With a 'permit holders only' type of restriction, every parked vehicle must display a permit, either a resident permit or a visitor permit. There is no provision for free short period stays in schemes such as this, apart from loading and unloading. Therefore the £2 daily permit is the only way for visitors to park. It is recommended to proceed as advertised.

Drawing No: 24135 Brook Road, Wormley – GODALMING SOUTH, MILFORD AND WITLEY

Response Type	Points raised in letter, online form or E-mail (extracts from more lengthy responses with personal details removed)
Support	But as a regular user I would also like to point out how much safer it would be having the existing yellow line after the 1st bend in Brook Road, being lengthened to incorporate the bend. It is a blind spot that is made worse if someone has pulled to the left to let oncoming traffic through.
Support	I firmly support the extension of yellow lines and parking restriction to this area of Brook Road which is just before the entrance to Bridewell Close and Franklin Court. At present any parking of a vehicle on this area causes any traffic proceeding up Brook Road to swing out and cause a danger to any vehicle attempting to exit Bridewell Close.
Support	I fully endorse this addition of yellow lines. When pulling out of Bridewell close into Brook turning left, there is no clear sight line until you pull into Brook Road. The speed limit is 40mph and many cars travel at that speed because the road is straight. The parking space for two vehicles on the left hand side before Bridewell close effectively makes it a single lane when cars are parked which is almost permanently. When you pull out of Bridewell Close it is currently extremely dangerous to face a vehicle travelling in the single channel at 40mph. I have narrowly avoided a collision on 3 occasions myself. If it is not changed it is only a matter of time before there is a serious accident. I commend adoption of this proposed change The speed limit along Brook road should be reduced to 20mph as it is effectively a country lane, and with two significantly sized care homes, cars travelling at 40mph constitute a hazard

	and danger. If the speed limit is not lowered, my prediction is a serious road accident and possible fatality. I believe further improvement to safety would be achieved by extending by two car lengths the yellow lines when you enter Brook road as currently when a vehicle is parked there you can barely get off the main road if there are several cars turning in. Also on the bend, it is blind and you almost run into the back of the parked cars, when there are oncoming vehicles. If this is not rectified I predict collisions taking place here. Unfortunately Brook Road has become a free overflow car park for Witely station for those who don't want to pay the parking charges. There are always plenty of available unused spaces in the car park. At the weekends there are very few cars parked on Brook Road, but Monday to Friday it is at full capacity effectively reducing it to a single lane road for residents. Thank you for considering my comments
Support	I am very pleased to support the closing of the 2 car gap in the yellow lines in brook road as this is very dangerous when entering Brook Road from Bridewell Close. Cars coming up brook road from the Petworth road are on the wrong side of the road when approaching Bridewell Close, as the cars that are leaving Bridewell Close need to edge forward to see the traffic on Brook Road it becomes very Hazardous.
Officer Recommendation	It is recommended to proceed as advertised.

This page is intentionally left blank